

REMARKSStatus of the Claims

Claims 1 and 4-9 are pending in this application. No claims have been canceled or added. Claim 1 has been amended to define the thickness of the cover. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at paragraph 0025 (the lower limit of 0.5 mm) and Table 4 (1.5 mm). Claim 6 has also been amended to clarify that the cover comprises an elastomer, wherein the elastomer is formed by using 4,4'-dicyclohexylmethane diisocyanate. Support for this editorial amendment is found at page 17, paragraph 0040. No new matter has been added by the above claim amendments. Applicants also submit that no new issues have been raised in the Reply that would require a new search or consideration. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Reply is entered.

Drawings

Applicants submit that no drawings are necessary to understand the present invention. The present invention is a golf ball with a core and a cover. The novel features of the invention are in the materials in which the core and cover are made. Pursuant to 35 USC §113, 37 CFR §1.81 and MPEP 608.02, an Applicant is only required to furnish a drawing of the invention when the drawing is necessary to understanding the subject matter to be patented. Moreover, the nature of the subject matter does not admit of an illustration by a

drawing. As such, Applicants maintain that no drawing is necessary to understand the subject matter to be patent and the objection should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects claim 6 as indefinite because it is allegedly not clear if dicyclohexylmethane diisocyanate is the elastomer or used to make the elastomer. Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Applicants amend claim 6 to clarify that the cover comprises an elastomer, wherein the elastomer is formed by using 4,4'-dicyclohexylmethane diisocyanate. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 102(e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 4-9 as anticipated by Rajagopalan USP 6,207,784. Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Applicants submit that the present invention is directed to a golf ball composed of a core and a cover. The cover is formed from thermoplastic polyurethane elastomer using alicyclic diisocyanate. The alicyclic diisocyanate can be selected from 4,4'-dicyclohexylmethane diisocyanate, 1,3-bis(isocyanatomethyl)cyclohexane, isophorone diisocyanate and trans-

1,4-cyclohexyl diisocyanate. The cover has a thickness of 0.5 to 1.5 mm. The core is formed from a rubber composition comprising cis-1,4-polybutadiene as a base rubber. The core of the ball has a deformation of 2.5 to 4.5 mm (98 to 1275 N); and the ball itself has a deformation of 2.4 to 4.0 mm (98 to 1275 N).

On the other hand, the golf ball of Rajagopalan '784 is a two piece golf ball with a core and cover. The cover of the ball described in Rajagopalan '784 is formed from anionic polyurethane ionomer containing alicyclic diisocyanate. The type of alicyclic diisocyanate disclosed is different from the present invention. The alicyclic diisocyanate in Rajagopalan '784 is sulfonated or carboxylated derivatives of alicyclic diisocyanate. Also, the thickness of the cover is not disclosed as being 0.5 to 1.5 mm as with the present invention. The core of the ball described in Rajagopalan '784 is formed from a base rubber cis-1,4-polybutadiene. However, the core and ball deformation values are not disclosed.

Applicants submit that the golf ball of Rajagopalan is not identical to the golf ball of the present invention. First, the thickness of the cover is not disclosed. The thickness of the present invention is an unusual thickness as it is rather thin as compared to the conventional thickness of a golf ball. This thinner cover imparts the golf balls excellent rebound characteristic. If the golf ball of the present invention were to

have the conventional cover thickness, the rebound characteristic would be very poor because of the type of cycloaliphatic diisocyanate used in forming the elastomer of the cover. To compensate for this poor rebound characteristic, Applicants adjusted the thickness of the cover to the range of 0.5 to 1.5 to achieve the excellent rebound characteristics as described in paragraph 0025 in the specification. Rajagopalan fails to even recognize this rebound problem.

Moreover, Applicants further submit that the core deformation of 2.5 to 4.5 mm distinguishes the present invention from the golf ball of the cited art. Applicants will submit a Declaration supporting the proposition that if the core deformation is less than 12.5 mm, then the resulting golf ball will have a poor shot feel. And if the core deformation is more than 4.5 mm, the golf ball is too soft and has a heavy and poor shot feel. As such, the core deformation range imparts the good shot feel to the present invention.

For the forgoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious over Rajagopalan. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

As Applicants have addressed and overcome all rejections in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$950.00 is attached hereto.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Kecia Reynolds (Reg. No. 47,021) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868

ADM/KJR/crt  
0020-4925P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000